

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-11, and 14 are objected to for various informalities. These claims have been amended to remedy these informalities.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. These claims have been amended to address the rejections.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glennon et al. (U.S. 5,805,173) and further in view of Buschman et al. (U.S. 4,479,142).

Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glennon et al. (U.S. 5,805,173), in view of Buschman et al. (U.S. 4,479,142), further in view of Klements et al. (U.S. 5,918,002).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glennon et al. (U.S. 5,805,173) in view of Buschman et al. (U.S. 4,479,142), in view of Klements et al. (U.S. 5,918,002), and further in view of Woo et al. (U.S. 5,425,101).

Claims 7 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glennon et al. (U.S. 5,805,173) in view of Buschman et al. (U.S. 4,479,142), and further in view of Woo et al. (U.S. 5,425,101).

Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the video data is segregated into data packets and control packets, and that there is a connected cable that “comprises: a uni-directional main link line arranged to carry only the data packets from the transmitter unit to the receiver unit; and a bi-directional auxiliary channel line arranged to carry the control packets between the transmitter unit and the receiver unit and vice versa.” Similar elements were present in prior claim 3. As such, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 3 will be discussed.

The Examiner argues that Glennon teaches a uni-directional main link and points to Fig. 2, bus 426 and 438 as evidence of this. The Examiner then also points to FIG. 2, 450-470 as evidence of a bi-directional audio channel.

As a threshold matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is incorrect regarding some of the elements of Glennon. Specifically, while the Examiner alleges that bus 426 and 438 are uni-directional, random bus 426 is indicated in the reference as being bi-directional. Specifically, FIG. 2 depicts the random bus 426 as having arrows on either side, indicating that communications occur in both directions, or bi-directionally. As such, it is only the last leg, 438, that is uni-directional.

Likewise, the Examiner indicates that 450, 460, and 470 are all bi-directional. However, VRDY 450 and Packet type 460 are depicted as having arrows only on one end, and hence are uni-directional. Only Status info line 470 is depicted as bi-directional.

Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the uni-directional main link is a line of a cable, and that the bi-directional audio channel is another line of the same cable. It is clear from FIG. 2 of Glennon that the uni-directional line 438 and bi-directional line 470 are not a part of the same cable. Indeed, they are not even connected to the same components. While both line 438 and 470 are connected to PACDAC 440, line 438 is connected on the other side to a display memory 428, while status info is actually connected to two other components, the media stream controller 414 and the video input controller 418. Clearly these lines are not part of the same cable, otherwise they would be connected to identical endpoints.

Furthermore, claim 1 also specifically indicates that both the uni-directional main link line and the bi-directional auxiliary channel line are connected to the same “transmitter.” Since, as described above, the lines in Glennon are connected to different transmitters, Glennon would not meet the elements of claim 1.

If instead the Examiner is attempting to combine bus 438 with random bus 426 and call them both together the uni-directional line (since random bus 426 and status info line 470 are both connected to the media stream controller 414), Applicant still believes that Glennon would fail to teach claim 1 because random bus 426 is not uni-directional.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

As to independent claims 8, 15, and 22 these claims contain elements similar to that as described above with respect to claim 1, and thus Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as described with respect to claim 1 above. Additionally, claims 8, 15, and 22 indicate that the cable is connected to a display. This further differentiates these claims from Glennon. In Glennon, the lines 438 and 470 are connected to a PACDAC 440 (packet-based digital-to-analog converter) that is located on the computer system. The display is connected to the PACDAC 440 via an NTSC/PAL connection or an RGB connection 444. Thus, the last leg of video communications uses analog signals, not digital, and simply use traditional RGB or NTCS/PAL cables (e.g., coaxial, RCA). There is no cable using those standards that contains both a uni-directional main link line and bi-directional auxiliary channel line. Indeed, all such lines are uni-directional. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 15, and 22 are in condition for allowance.

New dependent claims 19-21 have been added to indicate that the transmitter and the receiver/display are not connected by a clock line. Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification, paragraph [0045]. In contrast, Glennon connects media stream PACDAC 440 and controller 414 with a clock line 472 (see also col. 12, lines 22-27). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-21 are in condition for allowance for this reason, in addition to the reasons outlined above for independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-18 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For at least these reasons, claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 16-18 are not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art outlined in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/
Marc S. Hanish
Registration No. 42,626

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
408-255-8001